PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP

2	James I. Stang (CA Bar No. 94435) Debra I. Grassgreen (CA Bar No. 169978)		
3	John W. Lucas (CA Bar No. 271038)		
4	One Sansome Street, Suite 3430 San Francisco, California 94104		
5	Tel: 415.263.7000; Fax: 415.263.7010		
6	Email: jstang@pszjlaw.com dgrassgreen@pszjlaw.com		
	jlucas@pszjlaw.com		
7 8	[Proposed] Counsel to the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors		
9	UNITED STATES BA	ANKRUPTCY COURT	
10		CT OF CALIFORNIA	
11	SAN FRANCIS	SCO DIVISION	
	In re:	Case No.: 23-30564	
12 13	THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF SAN FRANCISCO,	Chapter 11	
14		RESPONSE OF THE OFFICIAL	
		COMMITTEE OF UNSECURED CREDITORS TO DEBTOR'S	
15		EMERGENCY MOTION FOR ORDER (1)	
16		AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF PREPETITION WAGES, SALARIES AND	
17	Debtor and Debtor in Possession.	EMPLOYEE EXPENSES; (2) TO PAY ACCRUED EMPLOYEE BENEFITS AND	
18		TAXES; AND (3) DIRECTING BANKS TO HONOR PAYROLL AND EXPENSE	
19		CHECKS [ECF No. 7]	
20		Hearing:	
21		Date: October 26, 2023 Time: 1:30 p.m.	
22		Place: Via ZoomGov	
23			
24	The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (the "Committee"), by its proposed counsel,		
25	hereby files this response (the "Response") to Debtor's Emergency Motion for Order (1) Authorizing		
26	Payment of Prepetition Wages, Salaries and Employee Expenses; (2) to Pay Accrued Employee		
27	Benefits and Taxes; and (3) Directing Banks to Honor Payroll and Expense Checks [ECF No. 7] (the		
28	"Wage Motion"), filed by The Roman Catholic Archbishop of San Francisco (the "Debtor") on		
C		Entered: 10/13/23 12:18:09 Page 1 of	

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

August 21, 2023. The Committee's Response addresses only the portion of the Wage Motion relating to Debtor's payment of prepetition wages, salaries, and employee expenses (the "Wages").

The Debtor Should Disclose Information -**Including Names - Regarding Sexual Abuse Perpetrators**

On August 25, 2023, the Court entered a generally routine order authorizing the Debtor to pay prepetition Wages. See Interim Order Granting Debtor's Emergency Motion for Order (1) Authorizing Payment of Prepetition Wages, Salaries, and Employee Expenses; (2) to Pay Accrued Employee Benefits and Taxes; and (3) Directing Banks to Honor Payroll and Expense Checks [ECF No. 42] (the "Wage Order"). While the Wage Order seeks to pay a *de minimis* amount of Wages, approximately \$3,700, the Wage Order notably provides the following:

> Nothing in this Interim Order authorizes the Debtor to make any payments that benefit, directly or indirectly, any credibly accused perpetrator of abuse, whether for wages, support, housing. prepetition claims, retirement or otherwise.

Wage Order, ¶8 (emphasis added).

In light of the above paragraph that the Debtor's voluntarily used in the Wage Order, the Committee requested a list of the Debtor's "credibly accused" perpetrators so that it could verify that the Debtor was not paying prepetition Wages of such individuals. In response, the Debtor informed the Committee that it has no such list of "credibly accused" and that the few individuals benefiting from the Wage Order are each on the Debtor's "good standing" list. In the end, the Debtor refused to provide any information about the many people who are subject to any type of abuse allegations.

The chapter 11 cases premised on decades of childhood sexual abuse claims, like this case here, are not just about the payment of abuse Survivors' claims. They are also about accountability, ownership of the past, the disclosure of information under the control of the Debtor that support Survivors' abuse claims, and insuring that the abuse suffered by more than 500 Survivors does not happen to any other children or adults after the Debtor emerges from bankruptcy.

The Court summarized the Committee's concern at the first-day hearing in this case: "If the

dasec23430564 Doc# 203 Filed: 10/13/23 Entered: 10/13/23 12:18:09 Page 2 of

¹ The term "credibly accused" as it relates to perpetrators of sexual abuse is not defined by law. The Committee must know how Debtor uses that term in order to assess the adequacy of its future disclosures of abuser names.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

debtor has a known abuser, whether it's a credible accusation or a[n] incredible one, I wonder why that person is on the payroll." See Tr. of August 24, 2023 hearing (attached hereto as Composite **Exhibit A**), at 25: 6-9.

At the initial Section 341 Meeting of Creditors on September 28, 2023, the Debtor's representative surprisingly stated that there are two active clergy members and two inactive clergy members in the Archdiocese of San Francisco who are subject to abuse allegations. See Tr. of September 28, 2023 meeting (attached hereto as Composite Exhibit B), at 22:16-32. The Debtor has represented to the Committee that the foregoing individuals are not benefiting from the proposed Wage Order.

The Debtor has failed to make public, or even to produce to the Committee, a list of all abusers - whether accusations against them are proven, credible, incredible, or otherwise. However, at least 192 Catholic arch/dioceses and religious order provinces in the United States have publicly disclosed the names (and other information) of people within their jurisdictions who have committed sexual abuse.² California is home to 12 Catholic arch/dioceses.³ All of the arch/dioceses in California – except for Debtor – have filed lists of abusers.⁴

The Committee does not object to the Motion but rather takes this opportunity to preview an issue that the Motion raises: the identification of the perpetrators giving rise to the more than 500 childhood sexual abuse claims. At the first day hearing, the Court noted, and the Debtor has made clear, that sexual abuse and claims arising from that sexual abuse, prompted filing of this bankruptcy case. See e.g., See Composite Exhibit A, at 66: 5-7 and 66:14-15.

The transparency required in this bankruptcy case starts with an honest accounting of who is an abuser. Not only does that assist in evaluating proofs of claim in the future, but also it lifts the veil of secrecy that the Committee's constituency – sexual abuse Survivors – have been held under for

[remainder of page left intentionally blank]

Filed: 10/13/23 a\$@C**23**4305744 Doc# 203 Entered: 10/13/23 12:18:09 Page 3 of

² See https://www.bishop-accountability.org/AtAGlance/diocesan and order lists.htm (viewed on October 12, 2023).

³ See https://cacatholic.org/about/ (viewed on October 12, 2023).

⁴ See n.1, above.

too many years. The Committee must be infe	formed about who Debtor knows to be a "credibly	
accused" perpetrator of sexual abuse and how Debtor defines "credibly accused." Such "credibly		
accused" perpetrators conceivably are not pu	ublicly named in lawsuits but are known to the Debtor	
Moreover, as we learned at the initial 341(a)	hearing, abusers may still be in ministry within the	
Archdiocese of San Francisco or otherwise h	nave access to children. Should the Debtor fail to	
voluntarily provide the information that 192	other Catholic entities throughout the country have	
provided in this regard, the Committee will s	seek it through discovery.	
Dated: October 13, 2023	PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP	
	By: /s/ John W. Lucas James I. Stang (CA Bar No. 94435) Debra I. Grassgreen (CA Bar No. 169978) John W. Lucas (CA Bar No. 271038) One Sansome Street, Suite 3430 San Francisco, California 94104 Tel: 415.263.7000; Fax: 415.263.7010 Email: jstang@pszjlaw.com dgrassgreen@pszjlaw.com jlucas@pszjlaw.com [Proposed] Counsel to the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors	

PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP Attorneys Atlaw San Francisco, California

COMPOSITE EXHIBIT A

(Selected Pages of the Transcript of the August 24, 2023 Hearing)

Doc# 203 Filed: 10/13/23 23 Entered: 10/13/23 12:18:09 Page 5 of dasec23430584

```
1
1
                      UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
                     NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 2
 3
                                   -000-
    In Re:
                                    ) Case No. 23-30564
 4
                                      Chapter 11
 5
    THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP
    OF SAN FRANCISCO
                                      San Francisco, California
 6
                                      Thursday, August 24, 2023
                                      1:30 PM
                         Debtor.
 7
                                      DEBTOR'S EMERGENCY MOTION FOR
 8
                                      INTERIM AND FINAL ORDERS (1)
                                      PROHIBITING UTILITY COMPANIES
 9
                                      FROM ALTERING, REFUSING OR
                                      DISCONTINUING SERVICE, (2)
10
                                      DETERMINING ADEQUATE
                                      ASSURANCE OF PAYMENT FOR
11
                                      POST-PETITION UTILITY
                                      SERVICES UNDER 11 U.S.C. §
12
                                      366, (3) ESTABLISHING
                                      PROCEDURES FOR DETERMINING
13
                                      ADEQUATE ASSURANCE OF
                                      PAYMENT, AND (4) SCHEDULING A
                                      FINAL HEARING FILED BY THE
14
                                      ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF
15
                                      SAN FRANCISCO [8]
16
                                      DEBTOR'S EMERGENCY
                                      APPLICATION FOR ENTRY OF AN
17
                                      ORDER (I) AUTHORIZING AND
                                      APPROVING THE APPOINTMENT OF
                                      OMNI AGENT SOLUTIONS, INC. AS
18
                                      CLAIMS AND NOTICING AGENT,
19
                                      AND (II) GRANTING RELATED
                                      RELIEF FILED BY THE ROMAN
20
                                      CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF SAN
                                      FRANCISCO [11]
21
                                      DEBTOR'S EMERGENCY MOTION TO
22
                                      (1) ESTABLISH NOTICE
                                      PROCEDURES, (2) FILE
2.3
                                      CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION
                                      UNDER SEAL, AND (3)
24
                                      TEMPORARILY SUSPEND DEADLINE
                                      FOR FILING PROOFS OF CLAIMS
25
                                      FILED BY THE ROMAN CATHOLIC
```

		2
1	ARCHBISHOP OF SAN FRANCISCO [10]	
2	DEBTOR'S EMERGENCY MOTION FOR ORDER (1) AUTHORIZING PAYMENT	
4	OF PREPETITION WAGES, SALARIES, AND EMPLOYEE	
5	EXPENSES; (2) TO PAY ACCRUED EMPLOYEE BENEFITS AND TAXES;	
6	AND (3) DIRECTING BANKS TO HONOR PAYROLL AND EXPENSE	
7	CHECKS FILED BY THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF SAN FRANCISCO [7]	
8	DEBTOR'S EMERGENCY MOTION FOR	
9	INTERIM AND FINAL ORDERS (1) AUTHORIZING CONTINUED USE OF	
10	EXISTING CASH MANAGEMENT SYSTEM, OPERATIONAL BANK	
11	ACCOUNTS AND RELATED INVESTMENT ACCOUNTS; (2)	
12	AUTHORIZING MAINTENANCE OF EXISTING BUSINESS FORMS, (3)	
13	EXCUSING COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 345(B); (4)	
14	AUTHORIZING CONTINUED USE OF CURRENT INVESTMENT POLICY;	
15	AND (5) SCHEDULING A FINAL HEARING FILED BY THE ROMAN	
16	CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF SAN FRANCISCO [9]	
17	DEBTOR'S EMERGENCY MOTION TO	
18	CONTINUE INSURANCE PROGRAMS FILED BY THE ROMAN CATHOLIC	
19	ARCHBISHOP OF SAN FRANCISCO [12]	
20	DEBTOR'S EMERGENCY MOTION FOR	
21	INTERIM AND FINAL ORDERS AUTHORIZING THE DEBTOR TO (1)	
22	PAY CERTAIN PREPETITION INVOICES FOR ABUSE SURVIVORS'	
23	ASSISTANCE AND SAFE ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMS, AND (2)	
24	CONTINUE ITS PREPETITION PRACTICE OF PAYING FOR ABUSE	
25	SURVIVORS ASSISTANCE AND SAFE	

		3
1	ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMS FILED BY THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF SAN FRANCISCO [13]	
3	HEARING REGARDING CASE	
4	MANAGEMENT	
5	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE DENNIS MONTALI UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE	
6	ADDEADANGES (All programt by rides on telephone).	
7	APPEARANCES (All present by video or telephone): For the Debtor: PAUL J. PASCUZZI, ESQ. Felderstein Fitzgerald Willoughby	
8	Pascuzzi & Rios LLP 500 Capitol Mall	
9	Suite 2250	
10	Sacramento, CA 95814 (916)329-7400	
11	For the Debtor: ORI KATZ, ESQ. Sheppard, Mullin, Richter &	
12	Hampton LLP 4 Embarcadero Center	
13	17th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111	
	(415)774-3238	
14 15	For the Debtor: PAUL E. GASPARI, ESQ. Weintraub Tobin Chediak Coleman & Grodin	
	475 Sansome Street	
16	Suite 510 San Francisco, CA 94111	
17	(415)772-9618	
18	For Office of the U.S. JASON BLUMBERG, ESQ. Trustee: United States Department of	
19	Justice	
20	501 I Street Suite 7-500	
21	Sacramento, CA 95814 (916)930-2076	
22	Also Present: Paul H. Deutch	
23	Executive Vice President, Omni Agent Solutions, Inc.	
24	Joseph J. Passarello	
25	Chief Financial Officer	

```
4
1
                                 Paula Carney
                                  Debtor's Representative
 2
                                 Wayne Weitz
 3
                                  Debtor's financial advisor
                                  professional
 4
                                 Paul H. Deutch
                                  Executive Vice President, Omni
 5
                                  Agent Solutions, Inc.
 6
 7
8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
    Court Recorder:
                                  LORENA PARADA
                                  United States Bankruptcy Court
19
                                  450 Golden Gate Avenue
                                  San Francisco, CA 94102
20
21
    Transcriber:
                                  RIVER WOLFE
                                  eScribers, LLC
22
                                  7227 N. 16th Street
                                  Suite #207
23
                                  Phoenix, AZ 85020
                                  (800) 257-0885
24
    Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording;
25
    transcript provided by transcription service.
```

The Roman Catholic Archbishop Of San Francisco

	5
1	SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, AUGUST 24, 2023, 1:31 PM
2	-000-
3	(Call to order of the Court.)
4	THE CLERK: Court is now in session, the Honorable
5	Dennis Montali presiding. Calling the matter of the Roman
6	Catholic Archbishop of San Francisco, case 23-30564.
7	THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon, everyone.
8	Welcome to the San Francisco Bankruptcy Court remote edition.
9	And let me get the appearances of principal counsel. And for
10	counsel, at the moment, let's defer for the time being the
11	introduction of the representatives of the debtor. But let me
12	just get the counsels' appearances.
13	MR. PASCUZZI: Thank you, Your Honor. Paul Pascuzzi,
14	Felderstein Fitzgerald Willoughby Pascuzzi & Rios, for the
15	debtor, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of San Francisco, a
16	corporation sole. We do have cocounsel on the line as well.
17	THE COURT: And is that Mr. Katz? Is he going to make
18	an appearance? Yes.
19	MR. KATZ: Yes, Your Honor. Good afternoon. Ori
20	Katz, Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton, appearing as
21	proposed cocounsel to the debtor.
22	THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Katz.
23	Mr. Blumberg.
24	MR. BLUMBERG: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Jason
25	Blumberg for the United States Trustee.

made pursuant to this order. And paragraph 9, Your Honor, is the paragraph that dealt with not making payments to credibly accuse perpetrators of abuse. So that provision was inserted to resolve the concern that had been raised in the objection.

THE COURT: Well, in all my experience, and I've never had a objection like that before, it dawned on me that if the debtor has a known abuser, whether it's a credible accusation or a incredible one, I wonder why that person is on the payroll. But secondly, it dawned on me that even if you are an abuser, which I don't condone, you're still entitled to be paid. So I don't know how we can ignore the right of a person to be paid if that person is paid, even though he or she may be under criticism for something unrelated to the paycheck.

So I believe, if I'm not mistaken, in the Oakland case, there was no limitation. In the Santa Rosa one, there was something similar. But I guess the way you're suggesting it, Mr. Katz, is that it's functionally out with a reservation in case one gets through, right; is that a fair way to say it?

MR. KATZ: Yes, Your Honor. I mean, functionally, we won't be making these payments on account of pre-petition claims, even if they would otherwise be entitled to priority, pending some further order of the Court. And to the extent anybody wants to step forward to challenge that mechanism or a payment that's been made, they're free to do so.

To borrow from Mr. -- I don't know if it was from Mr.

to any sort of decision on that issue, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Actually, Mr. Blumberg, your comment reminds me of something I meant to ask Mr. Pascuzzi.

Tell me if I'm wrong. I would assume that your focus is obviously on the survivors and the abuse claims -- that's what's driven the Archbishop to put the debtor into bankruptcy -- and that other creditors are almost incidental, not incidental in a sense that they aren't significant amount of money, but more likely than not they'll be unimpaired and treated under a plan like more ordinary course and that all the action is going to be with the survivors and their counsel and the kinds of things that you and I both know is what is endemic for these cases. And is that a fair assumption?

MR. PASCUZZI: That's a fair assumption, Your Honor. Yes.

THE COURT: Yeah. I mean, see, that's relevant also to things like claims bar date because chances are there may not even be any claims filed because if your schedules are complete and somebody that's owed money for some service that was rendered and scheduled correctly, that person doesn't even have to file a claim.

So I'm not changing my view on whether when the claims bar date is. I understand we're having two claims bar dates for this case because despite the U.S. Trustee definitions or the Administrative Office of U.S. Courts' definition of mega

PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL & JONES LLP Attorneys Atlaw San Francisco, California

COMPOSITE EXHIBIT B

(Selected Pages of the Transcript of initial September 28, 2023 Meeting of Creditors)

Case: 23-305645 Doc# 203 Filed: 10/13/23 Entered: 10/13/23 12:18:09 Page 13 of

CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT

ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF SAN FRANCISCO MEETING OF CREDITORS SEPTEMBER 28, 2023



Court Reporting • Video

310.230.9700 • els@elitigationservices.com www.elitigationservices.com

1 2 3	CEDRIC:	listen-only mode during today's Q&A session. If you'd like to ask a questions, please press star, then one. And I'd like to turn today's (inaudible) to your host, Mr. Jason Blumberg. Thank you, you may begin.
4 5 6 7 8	BLUMBER	Catholic Archbishop of San Francisco. That's case number 23-30564. This case was filed on August 21, 2023. Today's date is September 28, 2023. It's approximately 10:14 a.m. My name is Jason Blumberg. I'm a Trial Attorney with the Office of the United States Trustee.
9 10 11 12 13 14		This meeting is required under Section 341(A) of the Bankruptcy Code. The purpose of the meeting is to allow for an examination of the debtor under oath. Questions may include but are not limited to why the case was filed, the operation of the business, and the prospects for the organization. I will initially question the debtor the some degree. Creditors will also have an opportunity to examine the debtor.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24		As a reminder, the meeting is being digitally recorded. Please remember that the recorder cannot see who you are or your head nodding so please identify yourself when asking a question and please remember to give verbal responses, which can be picked up by the recorder. The recorder works best when only one person is speaking at a time so please allow for questions to be completed before answering and please wait for answers to be completed before asking follow-up questions. Whenever you are not speaking, please mute your line to prevent background noise. We keep the recording for two years after case closure. If anyone would like to obtain a duplicate of today's proceeding or a transcript, the arrangements are made to the Office of the United States Trustee.
25 26 27 28 29 30		Before we proceed with the 341 meeting, I'm going to take a few minutes to explain what this meeting is and how it will proceed. As I mentioned, this meeting is being conducted under Section 341 of the United States Bankruptcy Code in conjunction with the bankruptcy case currently pending before the United States Bankruptcy Court in the Northern District of California. As such, it is expected that every participant will conduct themselves in a manner appropriate for a legal proceeding.
31 32 33 34		Preliminarily, the statutory purpose of the meeting is to allow creditors the opportunity to ask questions of the debtor under oath. If you don't have any questions for the debtor's representatives, you may stay on the line and listen, but you also may drop off the call at any time.
35 36 37 38		The representatives of the debtor are Archbishop Cordileone, Father Patrick Summerhays, and Joseph Passarello. By court order, Father Summerhays has been designated as the debtor's responsible individual in this case. Mr. Passarello is the debtor's senior financial director. He signed the debtor's schedules and statements.

MEETING OF CREDITORS | eLitigation Services, Inc. www.elitigationservices.com 310.230.9700 • els@elitigationservices.com

ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF SF | SEPTEMBER 28, 2023

2 3 4 5	covered this next question, and the question I would typically ask here is, why did the debtor file for Chapter 11? I'll ask that question to you if youif you want to give a short kind of response, but I think we've covered it. But if you wouldn't mind just in a sentence or two repeating the reasons, it would be appreciated.		
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	SUMMERHAYS: Well, I think withwhen all the cases came in, we had to assess how we coul get to some type of a gloglobal mediation to make it manageable. And we tried some mediations and we weren't making any progress and so financially it looked like the best situation for resolving these cases equitably amongst those creditors, making sure that, you know, the first ones to the trial did not end at, you know, exhausting our resources andand being able to pay out equitably to all ourour plaintiffs, and then, also, allow us to maintain our operations here at the archdiocese, which is our responsibility, too. So it witit came to be able to do those two things and it's in myitit was unavoidable because of just the sheer number of cases we were trying to (inaudible).		
16 17			
18	SUMMERHAYS:Y	es, therethere arethere are active priests who've been accused.	
19	BLUMBERG:	Would you tell me, please, the number? How many?	
20 21	SUMMERHAYS: I mean, are theyarecan youare they just priests that are in active ministry?		
22	BLUMBERG:	Let's start there, yes, sir.	
23	SUMMERHAYS: I think it's two.		
24 25			
26 27 28		well, you could have someone who's retired who is, you know, in good g and can, you know, have activehe canhe can actually be publically ble).	
29	BLUMBERG:	Okay. I mean, are there any retired priests that have been accused?	
30	SUMMERHAYS:Y	es.	
31	BLUMBERG: Okay. So can you tell how many?		
32	SUMMERHAYS:I	believe there's two.	

MEETING OF CREDITORS | eLitigation Services, Inc. www.elitigationservices.com 310.230.9700 • els@elitigationservices.com

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	James I. Stang (CA Bar No. 94435) Debra I. Grassgreen (CA Bar No. 169978) John W. Lucas (CA Bar No. 271038) Pachulski Stang Ziehl & Jones LLP One Sansome Street, Suite 3430 San Francisco, California 94104 Telephone: 415.263.7000 Facsimile: 415.263.7010 Email: jstang@pszjlaw.com dgrassgreen@pszjlaw.com jlucas@pszjlaw.com		
8 9 10	[Proposed] Counsel to the Official Committee of Creditors UNITED STATES BA	Unsecured ANKRUPTCY COURT	
11	NORTHERN DISTR	ICT OF CALIFORNIA	
12	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
13			
14	In re:	Case No.: 23-30564	
15	THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF SAN FRANCISCO,	Chapter 11	
16 17	Debtor and Debtor in Possession.	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
18	STATE OF CALIFORNIA)		
19	CITY OF LOS ANGELES)		
20	I, Mary de Leon, am employed in the city	and county of Los Angeles, State of California. I	
21	am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 10100 Santa		
22	Monica Blvd., Suite 1300, Los Angeles, California 90067.		
23	On October 13, 2023, I caused to be serve	d the	
24	RESPONSE OF THE OFFICIAL COMMIT	TEE OF UNSECURED CREDITORS TO	
25	DEBTOR'S EMERGENCY MOTION FOR	ORDER (1) AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF	
26	PREPETITION WAGES, SALARIES AND ACCRUED EMPLOYEE BENEFITS AND	TAXES; AND (3) DIRECTING BANKS TO	
27	HONOR PAYROLL AND EXPENSE CHEC	CKS [ECF No. 7]	
28			
	I		

Case: 23-30564 Doc# 203 Filed: 10/13/23 Entered: 10/13/23 12:18:09 Page 17 of 23

in the manner stated below:

V	TO BE SERVED BY THE COURT VIA NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING (NEF): Pursuant to controlling General Orders and LBR, the foregoing document was served by the court via NEF and hyperlink to the document. On October 13, 2023, I checked the CM/ECF docket for this bankruptcy case or adversary proceeding and determined that the following persons are on the Electronic Mail Notice List to receive NEF transmission at the email addresses stated below	
V	(BY MAIL on Exhibit B attached) I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at San Francisco, California, in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.	
V	(BY EMAIL on Exhibit A attached) I caused to be served the above-described document by email to the parties indicated on the attached service list at the indicated email address.	

I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of California and the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on October 13, 2023 at Los Angeles, California.

/s/ Mary de Leon Mary de Leon

2

2	TO BE SERVED BY THE COURT VIA NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING (NEF):
3	Hagop T. Bedoyan hagop.bedoyan@mccormickbarstow.com, ecf@kleinlaw.com
4	Jason Blumberg jason.blumberg@usdoj.gov, ustpregion17.sf.ecf@usdoj.gov
5	John Bucheit jbucheit@phrd.com
6	George Calhoun george@ifrahlaw.com
7	Jason Chorley jason.chorley@clydeco.us, Robert.willis@clydeco.us
8	Blaise S Curet bcuret@spcclaw.com
9	Trevor Ross Fehr trevor.fehr@usdoj.gov
10	Robert David Gallo dgallo@phrd.com
11	Christina Lauren Goebelsmann christina.goebelsmann@usdoj.gov
12	Debra I. Grassgreen dgrassgreen@pszjlaw.com, hphan@pszjlaw.com
13	Robert G. Harris rob@bindermalter.com, RobertW@BinderMalter.com
14	Deanna K. Hazelton deanna.k.hazelton@usdoj.gov
15	Daniel James daniel.james@clydeco.us
16	Jeff D. Kahane jkahane@duanemorris.com
17	Ori Katz okatz@sheppardmullin.com, LSegura@sheppardmullin.com
18	Jeannie Kim jekim@sheppardmullin.com, dgatmen@sheppardmullin.com
19	John William Lucas jlucas@pszjlaw.com, ocarpio@pszjlaw.com
20	Alan H. Martin
21	Andrew Mina amina@duanemorris.com
22	Office of the U.S. Trustee / SF
23	Paul J. Pascuzzi ppascuzzi@ffwplaw.com, docket@ffwplaw.com
24	Mark D. Plevin mplevin@crowell.com, mark-plevin-crowell-moring-8073@ecf.pacerpro.com
25	Douglas B. Provencher dbp@provlaw.com
26	Nathan W. Reinhardt
27	Jason E. Rios jrios@ffwplaw.com, docket@ffwplaw.com
28	Matthew Roberts mroberts@phrd.com

Mailing Information for Case 23-30564

Entered: 10/13/23 12:18:09 Page 19 of 1 Doc# 203 Filed: 10/13/23

- Phillip John Shine phillip.shine@usdoj.gov
- Catalina Sugayan catalina.sugayan@clydeco.us, Nancy.Lima@clydeco.us
- Matthew Michael Weiss mweiss@phrd.com
- Harris Winsberg hwinsberg@phrd.com
- Yongli Yang yongli.yang@clydeco.us

EXHIBIT A EMAIL SERVICE

	Name	Email
A.S.; C.	B.; D.R.; H.F.; J.B.; J.D.; R.C.; R.F.; R.F. Jr.	kim@justcelc.com
Just La	w Collaborative	
Attn:	Kim Dougherty, Esq.	
Binder & Malter, LLP		rob@bindermalter.com;
Attn:	Robert G. Harris	robertw@bindermalter.com
Clyde 8	& Co US LLP	alex.potente@clydeco.us;
Attn:	Alexander Potente	jason.chorley@clydeco.us;
	Jason J. Chorley	Catalina.Sugayan@clydeco.us;
	Catalina J. Sugayan	Nancy.Lima@clydeco.us; yongli.yang@clydeco.us;
	Nancy Lima	Robert.willis@clydeco.us
	Yongli Yang	
	Robert Willis	
_	k Winkelman LLP	rcraig@craig-winkelman.com
Attn:	Robin D. Craig	
Crowe	II & Moring LLP	mturner@crowell.com; jhess@crowell.com;
Attn:	Miranda H. Turner	mplevin@crowell.com; mark-plevin-crowell-
/ ((())	Jordan A. Hess	moring-8073@ecf.pacerpro.com
	Mark D. Plevin	morning 6073@ccn.paccr.protectin
Duane Morris LLP		JKahane@duanemorris.com;
Attn:	Jeff D. Kahane	RWRoten@duanemorris.com;
	Russell W. Roten	AMina@duanemorris.com;
	Andrew Mina	NReinhardt@duanemorris.com
	Nathan Reinhardt	
Embol	den Law PC	dbp@provlaw.com
Attn:	Douglas B. Provencher	<u>αυρωριονίαw.com</u>
Attii.	Douglas B. Frovenciel	
Estey 8	& Bomberger, LLP	steve@estey-bomberger.com
Attn:	Stephen Estey	
	stein Fitzgerald Willoughby Pascuzzi & Rios LLP	ppascuzzi@ffwplaw.com; tphinney@ffwplaw.com;
Attn:	Paul Pascuzzi	<u>jrios@ffwplaw.com</u> ; <u>docket@ffwplaw.com</u>
	Thomas Phinney	
	Jason Rios	
Eioro A	schermann	saphia@thaEAfirm.com
Attn:	Sophia Achermann	sophia@theFAfirm.com
Attii.	Зорна Аспеннанн	

CDB C	CDD Crown Inc		
GDR Group, Inc Attn: Robert R. Redwitz		randy@gdrgroup.com	
Attn:	Robert R. Redwitz		
Ifrah Pl	LC	george@ifrahlaw.com	
Attn:	George Calhoun		
Kern Co	ounty Treasurer and Tax Collector Office	bankruptcy@kerncounty.com	
	sankruptcy Division		
	. ,		
McCorr	mick, Barstow, Sheppard, Wayte & Carruth LLP	hagop.bedoyan@mccormickbarstow.com;	
Attn:	Hagop T. Bedoyan	ecf@kleinlaw.com	
Attii.	Hagop 1. Bedoyan	ect@kiefflaw.com	
N	La Fiel Theory Art La Pilla College		
	des Fink Thorpe Michaelides Sullivan LLP	mlovell@nicolaidesllp.com	
Attn:	Matthew C. Lovell		
Office of	of the U.S. Trustee	christina.goebelsmann@usdoj.gov;	
Attn:	Christina Lauren Goebelsmann	phillip.shine@usdoj.gov;	
	Phillip J. Shine	deanna.k.hazelton@usdoj.gov;	
	Deanna K. Hazelton	jason.blumberg@usdoj.gov;	
	Jason Blumberg	<u>Trevor.Fehr@usdoj.gov</u> ;	
	Trevor Fehr	USTP.Region17@usdoj.gov;	
		<u>USTPRegion17.SF.ECF@usdoj.gov</u>	
Parker,	Hudson, Rainer & Dobbs LLP	tjacobs@phrd.com; jbucheit@phrd.com;	
Attn:	Todd C. Jacobs	hwinsberg@phrd.com; mweiss@phrd.com;	
	John E. Bucheit	mroberts@phrd.com; dgallo@phrd.com	
	Harris B. Winsberg		
	Matthew M. Weiss		
	Matthew G. Roberts		
	R. David Gallo		
Rosalie	Marcic	jv@jvlaw.com	
Attn:	Jeannette A. Vaccaro, Esq.		
Sheppa	rd, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP	amartin@sheppardmullin.com;	
Attn:	Alan Martin	okatz@sheppardmullin.com;	
	Ori Katz	jekim@sheppardmullin.com;	
	Jeannie Kim	dgatmen@sheppardmullin.com;	
		LSegura@sheppardmullin.com;	
		lwidawskyleibovici@sheppardmullin.com	
Sinnott	, Puebla, Campagne & Curet, APLC	bcuret@spcclaw.com	
Attn:	Blaise S. Curet	Source Special Micorn	
,	5.a.55 5. 6a.66		

Case: 23-30564 Doc# 203 Filed: 10/13/23 23 Entered: 10/13/23 12:18:09 Page 22 of

EXHIBIT B U.S. MAIL SERVICE

California Department of Tax And Fee Admin	P.O. Box 942879 Sacramento, CA 94279
California Office of the Attorney General	1300 St, Ste 1142 Sacramento, CA 95814
Colorado Department of Revenue	1881 Pierce St Lakewood, CO 80214
Employment Development Department	P.O. Box 989061 West Sacramento, CA 95798
Florida Department of Revenue	5050 W Tennessee St Tallahassee, FL 32399
Georgia Department of Revenue Processing Center	P.O. Box 740397 Atlanta, GA 30374
Internal Revenue Service	Attn: Centralized Insolvency Operation P.O. Box 7346 Philadelphia, PA 19101-7346
New Mexico Taxation and Revenue Department	P.O. Box 25127 Santa Fe, NM 87504
San Francisco County Clerk	1 Dr Carlton B Goollett Pl City Hall, Room 168 San Francisco, CA 94102
San Francisco Tax Collector	c/o Secured Property Tax P.O. Box 7426 San Francisco, CA 94120
San Mateo County Tax Collector	555 County Center, 1st Floor Redwood City, CA 94063
State of California Franchise Tax Board	P.O. Box 942867 Sacramento, CA 94267
The Roman Catholic Archbishop of San Francisco	One Peter Yorke Way San Francisco, CA 94109
Virginia Department of Taxation	P.O. Box 1115 Richmond, VA 23218
Virginia Employment Commission	P.O. Box 26441 Richmond, VA 23261

Case: 23-30564 Doc# 203 Filed: 10/13/23 Entered: 10/13/23 12:18:09 Page 23 of 23